R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 800 EA 000 873

LEADERSHIP IN A TIME OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE.

BY- GOULD, SAMUEL B.

PUB DATE 7 MAR 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.08 25P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LEADERSHIP, *EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, INSTITUTIONS, EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY, SCIENCES, LABOR, EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES, *PRESIDENTS,

SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGES ARE NECESSITATING MODIFICATIONS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP. LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE ARE DISCUSSED UNDER FOUR MAIN POINTS--(1) THE CHANGE IN THE NATURE OF OUR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, (2) THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL LEADER AS A RESULT OF THESE INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES, (3) THE CHANGE IN ATTITUDES TOWARD LEADERSHIP ON PRESENT-DAY CAMPUSES, AND (4) THE NEWLY RECOGNIZED ELEMENTS OF UNIVERSITY LIFE WHICH APPEAR IMMINENT. THIS NEW LEADERSHIP SHOULD BE MANAGERIAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND PERSUASIVE, AND SHOULD CREATE AN INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL CLIMATE FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGE AND ROLE COORDINATION. THIS ADDRESS WAS PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (CHICAGO, MARCH 7, 1967). (HW)

ED014800

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LEADERSHIP IN A TIME OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Address
by
Samuel B. Gould
Chancellor, State University of New York

Delivered at
Annual Conference
Association for Higher Education
Chicago, Illinois
March 7, 1967

EA 000 873

Annual Conference
Association for Higher Education
Chicago, Illinois
March 7, 1967

Leadership in a Time of Educational Change

I.

When Kerry Smith called a few months ago and asked me to speak on today's subject, I accepted partly because Kerry has a way of being very persuasive and partly because I thought it was a topic well worth talking about. But after I had put down the phone, I began to have serious reservations about the promise I had made. In the first place, I asked myself, wasn't it just a bit presumptuous for me to stand up in front of my peers and play the role of the expert on a subject like leadership? And the answer came back to me quickly enough: yes, it was--a somewhat disheartening and sobering answer, but a true one, since I had to admit that not a day passes in which I am unaware of some clear instance of failure on my part in meeting my obligations as a leader. Continuing my self-questioning, I next asked myself what I actually knew about leadership as it exists today in our colleges and universities. Here I was on slightly firmer ground because for well over two years I had been observing with more than casual interest the leadership characteristics and procedures of the sixty or so presidents of the campuses that comprise my own institution. (If some of them are here today, they are undoubtedly muttering to themselves that <u>they</u> have been observing <u>mine</u> with at least equal

fascination.) Such observations cannot help but stimulate the mind and sometimes make the blood race a little faster. One is bound to ponder over the mysterious inner motivations underlying the outward demonstrations of leadership and to search for some answers as to why all of us who have been put into leadership positions do as we do.

The subject of the nature and quality of educational leadership is a huge one, therefore, besides being complicated. And once I began to sketch the areas of subject matter which ought to be covered, it was my painful and frustrating discovery to realize that in my role as a speaker this afternoon I could do no more than make the barest beginning. It was an equally painful discovery to realize that the truly important things to be said about leadership are so subjective, so bound up in one's own being and character, that one cannot talk about them as methods or techniques--indeed, one cannot talk about them at all. Books and articles on leadership have always been unsatisfying to me, and I have often wondered why, since they are frequently lucid, orderly, and filled with wise precepts. They seem never to get to the heart of things--the heart of the leader, to be specific--and have an aura of "how-to-do-it" about them that generates superficial success but makes of leadership a disappointingly arid process. Perhaps this is an atypical reaction, however, and one I should keep to myself. I mention it only to ease my own conscience,

for in my assignment today I shall undoubtedly be committing the very error I deplore.

I can take refuge, however, in the more general aspects of this meeting's theme, namely that of leading education in new directions. This becomes more of an exercise in examining the future of higher education in the light of present circumstances and trying to show what the future college or university is likely to be. Here one is on somewhat safer ground since a good deal of it has been previously plowed. But such a future--any future, in fact--is linked to the quality of leadership with which it is likely to be shaped, and so one finds oneself still faced with the more subtle and subjective elements that mystify and trouble us all.

II.

It is a truism to say that the most striking characteristic of our time is change, rapid and even breathtaking change. Eric Hoffer, in his latest collection of essays, identifies "drastic change" as "the main difficulty and challenge of our age--from backwardness to modernity, from subjection to equality, from poverty to affluence, from work to leisure. These are all highly desirable changes, changes that mankind has hoped and prayed for through the millenia. Yet it is becoming evident

that, no matter how desirable, drastic change is the most difficult and dangerous experience mankind has undergone. We are discovering that broken habits can be more painful and crippling than broken bones, and that disintegrating values may have as deadly a fallout as disintegrating atoms." 1/

When Hoffer speaks of drastic change taking place generally in our society, he does not mention education specifically. Yet what he says raises for us in the academic world the spectre of a two-headed monster with which we must all struggle: the sweeping and revolutionary changes necessary to the process of education if it is to meet today's and tomorrow's needs effectively, and the equally impelling necessity for explaining as part of our educational responsibility to young and old alike the nature of the societal transformation going on all around us. We must change ourselves and at the same time be the foremost interpreters of change. This is no small task, yet its two parts constitute our most important concern. To neglect either one is to court tragedy.

I would truly like to explore both these aspects of change today, but there is obviously no time for this. And so I shall concentrate upon the first, simply because it is first rather than more important. To make my wanderings a little easier to follow, let me quickly identify

---

1/ Eric Hoffer, The Temper of Our Time (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

the main points I shall discuss. These are first, the change in the nature of our educational institutions; second, the emergence of a new type of educational leader as a result of these institutional changes; third, the change in attitudes toward leadership on present-day campuses; fourth, the newly recognized elements of university life which appear imminent.

Much more is happening to colleges and universities than their increase in size, although much of what is taking place has had the pressure of numbers as a motivating force toward change. The increase in numbers represents not only a surging population but a stronger desire for a college education by a larger percentage of college-age youth, coupled with a steady movement toward acceptance of the principle that all who can benefit from more education should have it. The junior or community college movement is spreading to the point where soon more than one-half the students entering college will be attending these institutions. New methods of instruction and new devices to aid instruction and research are commanding attention as never before; these explorations have great implications for the curricula and structures of colleges and universities of the future, even if the word "innovation" has been over-used to the point of losing much of its meaning. The financial rewards for the teacher are improving wherever one looks;

conversely, the availability of fully qualified and unusually able teachers is becoming more and more of a problem. And finally, the involvement of universities in public service of many types is drawing the academic world and the community together with new commonalities of interest.

We see, therefore, all around us a new preoccupation with very specific developments. I have already mentioned community colleges and new curricular patterns. We can easily add other specifics. Continuing education is one; university involvement in urban affairs is another. The relationship of Peace Corps activities to education is still another, for only in rare instances have there as yet been truly close linkages between this pragmatic use of student idealism to the regular academic life of a college or university. International education, in spite of its growth, still has many weaknesses and temptations to be overcome. Teacher education needs a most thorough reexamination as a forerunner to removing from much of it the stigma of academic flabbiness which has haunted it for so many years. And more recently there have been unmistakable stirrings over the place of the university in the development of the fine and performing arts in our society.

These are some of the outward signs we can all distinguish; each of you could easily add to the list. But there are other characteristics of change in colleges and universities, both private and public. Among private institutions, especially the smaller ones, one of these

has taken the form of banding together into coordinated groups for purposes of gaining collective strength, sharing facilities and personnel, and often participating in curricular development which no single one of the institutions could encompass by itself. Among public institutions another major shift has come in the proliferation of campuses. Having reached a point of growth where twenty or thirty thousand students are massed on a single campus, universities are tending more and more to create branches which ultimately have a certain autonomy of their own. This is in contrast to opening completely new institutions independent of any others. The advantages of this approach in time, in allocation of funds, and in the experience that can be called upon from existing campuses are readily seen. There are also disadvantages, of course.

What is developing as this trend continues is the establishment of institutional systems rather than the perpetuation of the single institution. In public higher education these systems are becoming state-wide; indeed, in some states the coordinating principle is expanding to include <u>all</u> colleges and universities. Nor is this simply coordination through academic representatives; it is more and more through lay boards and even super-boards.

III.

Obviously, the changing characteristics of our institutions and particularly their growth into systems have great effect upon the educational leadership demands and responsibilities. In addition to the

traditional sort of leadership exerted on the single campus (one with which we are all familiar), a new dimension has become visible, namely the leadership of a system or a combination of campuses or colleges. And this is leadership of a different sort even though it is based upon the same educational considerations that have always concerned us. It is educational, but it is also managerial; its managerial aspects, however, are tempered and made more difficult by the unmistakable and immutable peculiarities of the academic world.

As a result, the educational leader of a university system is constantly asking himself questions such as these: How can he create internally and externally a climate for acceptance of change, realizing as he does that the change will come, and all too swiftly? He faces the double duty of persuading administrators, faculties, and students on all his campuses to welcome the necessities for change, and of persuading executive and legislative authorities that they must be willing and ready to support these necessities. How can he bring about the substitution of new approaches to learning rather than have them merely piled upon the old? He knows the time-honored tendency to retain all that exists in a curriculum or departmental structure even when new elements are introduced; he knows also what this means in cost and facilities' use. How can he expect existing campuses within his system to change very much or rapidly enough to meet contemporary need when he knows so well the innate conservatism of faculties? The rights and responsibilities of

faculties in this regard are unchallengeable and must be honored. How can he plot the course of his institution for years ahead without frightening everyone concerned by the implications of his planning and without driving them toward a state of militant opposition? He is well aware that when he tells the truth about what will be required years hence, he will cause consternation among many and will engender open defiance from some.

Furthermore, this new breed of educational leader is one long step removed from his counterparts on individual campuses or at individual institutions. He has no regular and frequent relationships with faculties or with students; indeed, he must be assiduous in fostering local autonomy so that the head of the local campus is in every sense the educational leader of that campus. He visits his various constituencies only by invitation (if he is wise) and even then most often in relation to some ritualistic event. Almost inevitably he thus becomes a species of mystical figure with much shadow and little substance, remote and aloof, presenting one tiny particle of his responsibility and his personality to each separate group or individual he meets and thus becoming something different to each one. And, of course, as the representation of centralized authority, he is the scapegoat for whatever turns out badly in any part of the academic domain. Because he is so much isolated from campus life, he can easily fall into the danger of forgetting the true meaning of his own daily responsibilities: the supervision of physical growth, the long-range planning process, the

relationships with boards of control, the acquisition of financial resources, the interpretation of university aims and policies, the guiding and strengthening of the recruiting process, the protection of the university from political and other unwarranted interference. Yet in all these matters and more, he must be in constant communication with campus leaders, whether administrative, faculty, or student, in order that they may understand and come to terms with the general movement, the missions, and the aspirations of the university as a system.

Whether we think about new or old breeds of educational leaders, however, we are certainly cognizant that campus attitudes toward <u>any</u> sort of leadership are changing. Faculties to some extent and students to a very large extent are raising their voices more and more strongly, and while the message is not always completely clear, it is there for all to hear. Students in particular have become cynical about all forms of leadership and in some cases are advocating what amounts to anarchy. They were at first preoccupied with the restrictive elements of law or, in fact, any type of regulation. Now they are questioning the necessity or desirability of any kind of orderly process. And while this is an extremist view, its impact should not be minimized. It will find an increasing number of disciples, particularly as we in the so-called adult academic world continue our dilatory and snail-like progress toward adapting ourselves and our institutions to a drastically changing society. As Louis Benezet said so colorfully, the students shout, "Relevance!" at us, and we shout back, "Responsibility!"

But there are those who see no connection between the two, and who feel their only responsibility is to be deliberately disruptive. There is serious question as to whether there is any possibility of coming to terms of any sort with such a philosophy; the answer is very probably there there is no such possibility. Yet there are ways to increase the measure of student involvement in patterns that can satisfy their legitimate requests, patterns that add strength to our institutions of learning and, indeed, to the total democratic process. To find these patterns is a serious and immediate task for the present-day educational leader.

As to faculty and students together, the time has come for a truly unequivocal delineation of where the responsibility for educational leadership properly belongs and in what degree it is shared by different parts of the academic community. Practical considerations make it plain that the president's function of educational leadership is one which he cannot and should not undertake unilaterally. To begin with, it is beyond his mental and physical resources to do so; moreover, such an approach is destined to failure. Thus, he must call upon the talents and experience of the faculty as well as their primary concern for academic development and, to a lesser but significant extent, upon the experience of the students as the ones most directly and most quickly affected by educational change. It is the responsibility of the faculty to think deeply about the academic aspects of the institution not only in terms of their own disciplines but

in broader connotations, as well; it is the responsibility of the students to add as their contribution an evaluation of the effectiveness of what is being done and to make suggestions for improvement. The ultimate responsibility for encouraging and coordinating all such recommendations, however, remains with the president, particularly since total resources are always limited and priorities must always be set.

This is a statement with which some segments of the faculty or some groups of students are inclined to take issue, and so it is incumbent upon me to explain my position. I base it upon what I shall call, for lack of a better term, "the mandate of accountability," a phenomenon of life that goes far beyond the inner workings of the academic world. It is the basis for law and order and the curb upon individual action. It is the only proper limitation upon such action, whether in the family, in social and political life, indeed in every aspect of human relationships. Simply stated, it is the conviction that when something is done, somebody must be held accountable for the consequences.

At first glance such a theory does not appear to be unusual or to present many problems. In political life, for example, the actions of elected officials are always subject to the scrutiny of the electorate, and, as a result, shifts in party control and in personalities occur with reasonable regularity. In the business world the emphasis upon accountability is even more evident and changes can be even swifter and more

sweeping. In our everyday relationships to one another in society, we make judgments and perform actions in the clear knowledge that we shall be held responsible for these either through the workings of law or through the reactions of those with whom we associate. There is never any question as to who permitted or initiated the action, and thus there is never any question as to who is accountable.

In academic life the same theory must exist if there is not to be chaos. Participation of faculty and students in academic and other matters pertaining to the institution is not only to be encouraged but is, indeed, essential for the shaping of appropriate decisions. But the consequences of such participation and such decisions fall squarely upon the shoulders of one man alone, and this is the president acting under the delegated authority of his board of trustees. A series of wrong decisions reflects upon him and no one else. He cannot place even part of the blame for any blunders upon faculty or students, since individually they cannot even be identified oftentimes for their part in recommending or advising or deciding. He is the only accountable person.

Accountability is not so readily understood and is not so clear in the college or university as in other walks of life, however. The academic structure has within it elements that sometimes make accountability more difficult to apply or even to identify. In the first place, we

call upon faculty and sometimes upon students to serve on committees dealing with subjects outside their normal range of competence. Their judgments on such matters are almost always of great value, but this does not mean they should be binding. To argue otherwise would be to advocate a species of amateurism as the guiding philosophy of the institution. In the second place, there are built-in protections in university life (such as tenure for faculty, to name only one) that make the problem even more complex. These protections are appropriate, but they cause confusion when they are used for purposes other than those for which they were designed.

And thirdly, one must not forget the tremendous power wielded by faculties stemming from what I shall call "the authority of inertia." Opposition of faculty to a proposed plan of action, or even reluctance on their part to try it, is sufficient to slow down any change with an effectiveness that far outweighs the decision-making power. Nor does this opposition or reluctance need to be avowed openly; it can exhibit itself in more subtle ways and sometimes does. If there were time, we could examine together the whole committee process, for example, as it exerts this authority I speak of and as it relates to accountability.

IV.

Educational leadership exists in a new era, therefore, surrounded by a new set of circumstances and affected by them. It is undergoing change along with everything else in our academic world. As an

interpreter of such change, what should it now be doing to point the way, to take our society toward new directions and new educational necessities? What is the university of the future to be, and wherein will it differ from what we now live with and know?

The conditions under which our society will live in the decades ahead are readily identifiable. First and foremost among these is the continuation of the movement toward increased equality of opportunity for all; in such a movement, education is a prime factor, and as time goes on, higher education will be the goal for more and more of our youth. Education beyond the high school will involve a far higher percentage of our college-age men and women. Twenty years ago it was about 20%; today it is approaching 40%; twenty years hence it will be at least 60%. And mass education of this magnitude is bound to be supported more and more by public funds.

But there are other factors that will affect higher education both in size and character, and I can only touch upon them briefly. We must bear in mind, for example, the creation of increased leisure time for so many of our citizenry. The process of automation is making us reassess not only the nature of our work in the future but the time it will take to do it. In spite of the fears presently being expressed as to what such a process does to our civilization, we must not forget that we have here one of the great liberating elements for mankind. Our old concepts of human labor are being

threatened, and perhaps it is all to the good that they are. The various forms of automation raise man's potential, releasing him from drudgery.

It will be inevitable, I believe, that as this leisure time becomes available, the responsibility for education to help fill it will become more marked. A system of continuing education for all, regardless of age and circumstance, will become one of the most rapidly expanding elements of the future. Such a system will reach new heights of flexibility and will touch upon every facet of cultural and educational life. It will necessarily be highly individualized, as indeed will all of education in the future, and will create a new kind of citizenry with broader interests and new motivations for self-fulfillment.

Automation is only one manifestation of the role of technology today. The continuing discoveries of science will give higher education new challenges to meet if it is to prepare students adequately. And as a handmaid to these discoveries the computer as a technological tool will reshape many aspects of our society, giving us a speed in acquisition of knowledge and in problem-solving we thought impossible only a few years ago. Every part of our lives will be touched. With man's knowledge of his world and universe doubling every ten years, we shall have to reevaluate completely the purposes and methods of education.

The virtual disappearance of unskilled human labor will place still another burden upon higher education. The demands of the future will be for skilled workers in all fields, for a huge increase in technicians as well as the more professionally trained. And higher education will be expected to provide the training. Every formal discussion of manpower needs and the training necessary to meet those needs culminates in agreement that our colleges and universities must play a major role in providing the great reservoir of human ability which our country and the world wish to tap. Business, industry, the health professions in all their diversity, public agencies, even cultural groups--all have the same basic request and all make it to the institution that represents higher education.

It is evident also that we shall never again see the day when there are enough buildings or other educational facilities and enough faculty to take care of the country's needs. Even the most massive kinds of building or recruiting programs will not bring us to a point of proper balance. And on the recruitment side, the problem is not merely that of numbers but touches upon the quality of those recruited.

With such conditions prevailing, new approaches must be sought both in the use of facilities and in the learning process itself. We must start asking ourselves whether every aspect of higher education needs to be carried out on a campus, whether the home cannot be utilized more, whether television,

radio, and other communication techniques should not be employed more widely to ease the strain on facilities and to expose master teachers to most students, whether the present concept of relaying knowledge in the classroom and lecture hall is a valid one or whether the times and educational philosophy do not, in fact, call for more independent study for the student. We must also reexamine the entire recruiting process, the degree requirements and certification requirements for teachers and how these were originally created, the ways by which men and women of ability can be attracted to the teaching profession--these are only illustrative of how radically changed our traditional attitudes and presuppositions must become. The problem of insufficient faculty will lead eventually to an involvement by citizens generally in active assistance to our educational systems at all levels such as we have never dreamed of before. I will predict that within a few decades one out of every two adults in this country will in some way be close to the educational process, either in some sort of study or some sort of teaching, or both. And what may have started as a crisis move may turn out to be a permanent characteristic of our civilization contributing importantly to the democratic ideal.

We already see all around us the ways by which the world is growing smaller. We see what the advances in transportation are doing to draw the people of many countries closer together, whether for economic or other

reasons. We see how the discoveries of science cross the boundaries of nations and how the exchange of cultural achievements gives new insights into the thought and motivations of other countries. We see the fumbling but nonetheless important efforts toward a kind of world citizenship brought about through our fears of mass annihilation. The logic of peace is more unmistakable than ever, although it is too often couched in over-idealistic language. Essentially we are discovering what we, in fact, have always known: that peace is based upon mutual trust, that trust is based upon knowledge of one another, that knowledge comes about through thorough study and face-to-face experience.

It is through our educational patterns of the next several decades that we have the surest path toward peace, even though uneasy victories may be won meanwhile in the short run because of practical necessities. And as is the case in so many other components of life, the university and education generally will have to bear the brunt of responsibility in <u>preparing men and women for world peace efforts</u> that are more permanent in possibility because they are based on more humane understanding.

V.

With these conditions of society ahead of us and with education so much involved, the image of the university of tomorrow becomes reasonably

clear whether one thinks of its philosophical, structural, sociological or other manifestations.

Such a university is bound to be far less structured and far more flexible than it has been. It will be geared to fulfilling the needs of individuals more than ever before and will place less store upon the formalized patterns so long sacrosanct. People of all ages and conditions will move about within and around it more freely, taking from it what they require without so much attention to degrees and course credits. The prestige of university attendance will decline as a symbol of status because education will become part of the normal continuing pattern of existence. A much larger percentage of the university population will be seeking knowledge for its own sake rather than as a way to join the degree hierarchy. Only the most advanced degrees will have significance. And for everyone who comes to the university, competence rather than course credits will be the basis of measuring progress.

The university will be far more interested in expounding the principles and philosophy underlying a body of knowledge and skills than in the knowledge itself. The latter will be left to the student to search out and master for himself. In a society where skills become obsolescent with almost breathtaking rapidity, and where knowledge increases in volume by geometric proportions from year to year, it cannot be otherwise. Electronic means of storing and

retrieving knowledge will speed up this part of the learning process and make possible more concentration in depth upon the significance of that knowledge. This will, in turn, affect the techniques of teaching, since it will open wider the door to opportunities for creative discussion and experimentation.

The electronic means for aiding the learning process, whether we think of those already in use or those still to be devised, will amplify the opportunities for great teachers to reach many more students than heretofore. They will reach them in large or small groups or even individually, since it will be possible for a student to select the prerecorded lecture or demonstration he wishes and use it at his own convenience (and more than once, if this is necessary for him). The old formal lines that have always marked higher education (the two-year or four-year pattern for graduation, for example) will disappear, and students will progress toward a degree or toward completion of a course of study at the rate of speed most suitable to their individual needs. Furthermore, there will be such a high degree of cooperation and coordination among educational institutions, private and public alike, in the sharing of faculties, facilities, and programs that students will move rather freely from institution to institution within the region.

The continuing development of our urban civilization will cause the university of the future to be relatively large and located in a thickly populated

area. It will also be located in close juxtaposition to research and cultural agencies of the community and will carry on its work in close association with these. The physical attributes of such a university will concentrate upon those necessary for learning rather than living. Most students will live at home or at least be themselves responsible for their own living necessities. Obviously, under such circumstances the time-honored American college and university concept of in loco parentis will disappear. The university will emphasize human values in education through its programs of study and the daily contacts between students and faculty rather than through its residential arrangements. Thus, the independence of the student and recognition of his capabilities as a mature being will be increasingly emphasized; so, also, will his accountability for the consequences of his actions be increased.

It is clear that the university as I have described it will find it difficult to maintain the old sentimental attachments with its alumni and friends. Students will turn to so many different resources in carrying on their education (including more than one educational institution)that they will be far less sure about where their sentimental loyalties lie. They will, however, be infinitely more loyal to the concept of education for all, wherever and in whatever manner it is acquired. I shall not dare to predict what this new pattern may do to intercollegiate

football; this is a phase of development I have not examined carefully. I could remind you of Robert Hutchins' rather fanciful suggestion made many years ago that universities should each acquire a string of race horses and run them in competition on Saturday afternoons; this would obviate the necessity for worrying about the scholastic standings of the participants and would still leave open the income-producing possibility for the institutions as well as satisfying the chauvinistic tendencies of alumni. Mind you, I am not recommending this; I am merely reporting a suggestion.

The global aspects of the university will become steadily more apparent. More and more students will travel to other parts of the world for a portion of their education, and faculty from other countries will exchange with our own more frequently. Associations between universities of different countries will increase, and our own universities will concentrate a good portion of their service activities to assisting underdeveloped countries to newer and higher standards of achievement. Out of this may come a sturdier foundation upon which hopes for world peace can be built, although there is insufficient evidence thus far to indicate that this may indeed be the result. If the theories of certain anthropologists and other behavioral scientists are correct, namely that the desire to dominate is an innate characteristic of human life and can be traced through thousands of years, then we have cause

to wonder how successful we shall be. We can only hope and, while doing so, work mightily to broaden world understandings among all the nations.

VI.

To lead higher education in new directions such as those I have just attempted to describe is imperative but more difficult than ever. The campuses and the campus climate in which leadership must take place offer problems and obstacles of great complexity. Part of our democratic heritage, accentuated in the past decade or two, is to yearn mightily for leadership and then to array oneself against it whenever it appears. The genius of the leadership of the future, therefore, will be in the persuasive power it can exert rather than in its directorial authority. And this, after all, is the highest quality of leadership since it guarantees acceptance from those who follow.

The university is vital in any society, but in a democracy it is priceless. We must nourish it, guard it, cherish it as our main harbinger of hope. If the world is to prosper and be more humane as it does so, it will need the university as never before, since we now live in a time when ignorance is unthinkable and unacceptable not only for its grossness but for its danger. Whatever forms it may take, whatever changes it undergoes, the university is the centrality in which the promise of mankind is nurtured and brought closer to reality. With intelligent, sensitive, dedicated, and courageous leadership it can create a more enlightened America and a more enlightened world.